APR 2 0 7006 W

AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07/05) Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Docket Number (Optional) PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW ITL.0320US (P8003) Filed Application Number I hereby certify that this corespondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for 09/522,053 03/09/2000 Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR First Named Inventor April 17, 2006 Scott A. Rosenberg Signature Art Unit Examiner Typed or printed 2623 Ngoc K. Vu name Janice Munoz Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. I am the applicant/inventor. ∕Signature assignee of record of the entire interest. Timothy N. Trop See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. Typed or printed name (Form PTO/SB/96) attorney or agent of record. (713) 468-8880 28,994 Registration number Telephone number attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. April 17, 2006 Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 Date NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Tradeamrk Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

\_ forms are submitted.

\*Total of

## TE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Scott A. Rosenberg et al.

Group Art Unit:

2611

Serial No.:

09/522,053

Examiner:

Ngoc K. Vu

Filed:

March 9, 2000

Atty. Dkt. No.:

ITL.0320US (P8003)

For:

Displaying Heterogeneous

Video

Assignee:

Intel Corporation

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REASONS FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir:

Applicant seeks pre-appeal review of the rejections of claims 11-13.

Claim 11 calls for a packetization device to independently packetize at least two moving picture video streams in different frame rates.

The rejection suggests that the packetization device is in the encoder 8 in Figure 5. However, it should be noted that the encoder 8 comes in the stream after the input signal monitoring unit 3. That unit 3 does not receive all the video streams. Instead, it selects one video stream, as indicated by the arrow from the camera 1-2 to the input signal monitoring unit 3. See column 7, lines 26-38. There, it is explained that only one frame is selected from one camera.

The goal is obviously to compose the array of still pictures shown in Figures 2A-2D. There are no moving pictures, but, instead, a series of stills collated into one picture from as many as four cameras.

The way this is done is better explained in the cited Figure 12 and in the specification at column 13, lines 41-56. As shown in Figure 12, the video signals 1-4 have different frame rates.

Date of Deposit: <u>April 17, 2006</u>
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Janice Munoz

In order to select the signals successively from the moving picture streams, one frame is pulled successively from each stream. Thus, from the video signal stream number 1, the first frame is taken out and from the video signal 2 the second frame is taken out. From the video signal stream 3 its fourth frame is taken out and from the video signal stream 4 its fifth stream is taken out. The reason that these particular frames are selected is that this technique enables a clean frame to be extracted after extracting the previous frame from the previous stream. Thus, in the case of video stream 3, its frame 3 was skipped because it occurred during some of the time that frame 2 occurred in video signal stream 2.

Thus, what is encoded in the encoder 8 is a series of stills or signal frames pulled from the various streams. Thus, the packetization device asserted to be in the item number 8 in Figure 5 does not independently packetize two moving picture video streams. Instead, if anything, it packetizes a series of displaced single frames that cannot be called moving picture video streams and no longer have any frame rate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 17, 2006

Timothy N. Trop/Reg. No. 28,994

TKOP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100

Houston, TX 77024 713/468-8880 [Phone] 713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation